



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,670	11/27/2001	Song Han	19111.0053	8023

23517 7590 02/24/2006

SWIDLER BERLIN LLP
3000 K STREET, NW
BOX IP
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

PATEL, DHAIRYA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/993,670	HAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dhairya A. Patel	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10,11,13-17,20,21,23-27 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-11,13-17,20-21,23-27 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 12/7/2005 was been fully considered and entered.
2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered.
3. Claims 1,10,11,20,21,30 were rejected under 35 USC 112 first paragraph. The rejection under 35 USC 112 first paragraph has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,3-7,10,11,13-17,20,21,23-27,30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reed et al. U.S. Patent # 6,263,209 (hereinafter Reed) in view of Souissi et al. U.S. Patent # 6,091,959 (hereinafter Souissi).

As per claim 1, Reed teaches a method for providing location-based event service comprising the steps of:

- a) obtaining information indicating a current location of a plurality of mobile users, including a selected mobile user; (column 5 lines 17-28, lines 54-63)

The reference teaches getting the information about plurality of mobile users who have portable subscriber units with the mobile phone about their current location and fixed portion including a user selected (column 5 lines 54-63).

b) determining if at least one condition relating to location of the plurality of mobile users is satisfied based on the indicated current location of the selected mobile user (column 5 lines 17-28, lines 54-67);

The reference teaches comparing the current location just taken with the attribute stored in the database (determining at least one condition) to determine whether an alert is necessary. The attribute is collected from the plurality of users and their portable subscriber units (column 5 lines 17-28). Then the comparison is made from the current location of the user selected and the attribute collected from the plurality of users, which is stored in the database. Therefore when the comparing the current location with the attribute stored in the database is satisfied is same as determining if at least one condition (comparing) relating to a locations of the plurality of mobile users.

c) performing at least one event, if at least one condition is satisfied (column 5 lines 54-67) (column 6 lines 1-4); and

The reference teaches if the condition is satisfied an alert (one event) is generated.

Reed fails to teach determining a time interval to wait before repeating steps a)-c), wherein the step of determining a time interval to wait comprises the step of selecting as the selected mobile user a mobile user from plurality of mobile users from whom performing steps a)-c) contributes least to traffic overhead on a mobile network, and determining the time interval to wait based on the selected mobile user.

Souissi teaches determining a time interval to wait comprises the step of selecting as the selected mobile user a mobile user from plurality of mobile users which

contributes least to traffic overhead on a mobile network (column 7 lines 3-15)(column 7 lines 33-67) (column 8 lines 1-21).

The reference teaches two examples in which plurality of users each with portable subscribers units, the controllers selects or begins with the user with the portable subscriber unit based on the location of the user by calculating the distance between the specific location of the event and the location at which the portable subscriber unit is positioned from plurality of portable subscribers units (selecting mobile user from plurality of mobile users)(column 7 lines 33-53).The controller picks the user with portable subscriber unit which has the closest location therefore reducing over-the-air-traffic in the network (contributes least to traffic overhead on a network) (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 33-53). The reference also teaches determining the predetermined time to wait which is one minute when a sufficient response of the message has not occurred from the user (time interval to wait based on the selected user) (column 7 lines 53-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Reed et al's invention with to determine the time interval to wait comprises selecting as the selected mobile user from plurality of mobile users that is contributes least to traffic overhead. The motivation for doing so would have been so that to find out from the current location of the users, which individual user of the plurality of mobile users would be the first one to respond quickly or who would be the last user to respond and therefore reducing over-the-head traffic (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 48-53).

As per claim 3, Reed and Souissi teaches the method of claim 1 but

Souissi further teaches, wherein the step of: determining a time interval to wait based on the selected mobile user comprises the steps of:

- estimating a time at which the selected mobile user is likely to satisfy a condition based on at least one of: a distance from a current location of the selected mobile user to a region relevant to the condition, a velocity of the selected mobile user; and (column 7 lines 33-67) (column 8 lines 1-21)

The reference teaches sending message to the users who are likely to satisfy a condition based on the distance of the location of the users based on the current location at which the user is positioned to the specific location of the event (region relevant to the condition).

- determining the time interval to wait based on the estimated time at which the selected mobile user contributes least to traffic overhead. (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 33-67) (column 8 lines 1-21).

The reference teaches determining the time interval to wait based on the calculated distance and time at which a selected user is likely to respond to help message transmission and picking the user who respond quickly based on location and skipping those who are far away which would reduce over-the-air traffic (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 33-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Reed et al's invention to estimate at time a selected mobile user likely to satisfy a condition and determine a time interval to wait based on estimated time which the user contributes least to traffic overhead. The motivation for

Art Unit: 2151

doing so would have been to determine the wait and to find out from the current location of the user how much estimated time it is going to take for the selected user to respond and reducing over-the-air traffic. (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 48-53).

As per claim 4, Reed and Souissi teaches the method of claim 3, but Reed further teaches wherein the obtaining step comprises the steps of:

- searching a cache operable to store information indicating locations of mobile users for information indicating a location of the selected mobile user; (column 5 lines 54-67) (column 6 lines 1-4) (column 6 lines 21-34)

The reference teaches portable subscriber unit records (Cache) the information indicating the locations of mobile user and later uses the cache to compare it.

- using the information indicating the location of the selected mobile user as the information indicating the current location of the selected mobile user, if the information indicating the location of the selected mobile user is found in the cache; (column 5 lines 54-67) (column 6 lines 1-4, lines 21-34, lines 45-52) and

The reference teaches comparing the current location information with the attribute (stored in cache) to determine if the alert is necessary.

- querying at least one mobile positioning server to obtain the information indicating the current location of the selected mobile user, if the information indicating the location of the selected mobile user is not found in the cache. (column 6 lines 1-4, lines 21-52)

As per claim 5, Reed and Souissi teaches the method of claim 4, but Reed

further teaches wherein the at least one event comprises transmitting a message (column 5 lines 54-67) (column 6 lines 1-20).

The reference teaches the alert message is transmitted to the mobile user.

As per claim 6, Reed and Souissi teaches the method of claim 5, but Reed further teaches wherein the message is transmitted to a mobile user. (Column 5 lines 54-67) (Column 6 lines 1-20). The reference teaches the alert message is transmitted to the mobile user.

As per claim 7, Reed and Souissi teaches the method of claim 5, but Reed further teaches wherein the message is transmitted to a non-mobile user (Column 6 lines 31-62).

The reference teaches updates the second customer (non-mobile user) about the delay of the sales person (Mobile user) who was scheduled to arrive at a certain time.

As per claim 10, Reed and Souissi teaches the method of claim 4, but Souissi further teaches wherein the contribution to the traffic overhead on a mobile network relates to a location of the plurality of mobile users and to a time (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 33-67) (column 8 lines 1-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to implement Reed et al's invention to have contribution to network overhead which relates to location of plurality of mobile users and to a time. The motivation for doing so would have been to find out from the current location of the users, which individual user of the plurality of mobile users would be the first one to respond quickly or who would be the last user to respond (column 7 lines 48-53).

As per claims 11,13-17,20, they teach same limitations as claims 1,3-7,10 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

As per claims 21,23-27,30, they teach same limitations as claims 1,3-7,10 respectively, therefore rejected under same basis.

Remarks

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered.

5. Applicant stated the following remarks:

A). Souissi does not disclose or suggest that information relating to contribution to traffic overhead on a network is related in anyway to the messages sent to the portable subscriber units

As per remark A, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant because in column 7 lines 3-15, lines 33-67, Souissi teaches the controllers selects or begins with the user with the portable subscriber unit based on the location of the user by calculating the distance between the specific location of the event and the location at which the portable subscriber unit is positioned from plurality of portable subscribers units (selecting mobile user from plurality of mobile users)(column 7 lines 33-53). The controller picks the user with portable subscriber unit, which has the closest location therefore reducing over-the-air-traffic in the network (contributes least to traffic overhead on a network) (column 7 lines 3-15, lines 33-67). Since the picking the user closest to the location or who respond quickly reduces the over-the-air traffic because if the user is responds quickly the help message is taken care of early which reduces the help messages and over-the-air-traffic on the network which relates to information relating to

the contribution to the traffic on the network and messages sent to the portable subscriber units.

B). Souissi nor Reed does not teaches delay is related to the relative traffic over the network that communications with a given portable subscriber unit would contribute and may include such consideration as the location of a given portable subscriber unit, the local time of a given portable subscriber unit, or the activity of other portable subscriber units near a given portable subscriber unit.

As per remark B, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. Examiner did not find in the claim language where it states "delay is related to the relative traffic over the network that communications with a given portable subscriber unit would contribute and may include such consideration as the location of a given portable subscriber unit, the local time of a given portable subscriber unit, or the activity of other portable subscriber units near a given portable subscriber unit". Examiner would like to point out that Reed in column 5 lines 17-28, lines 54-67 and column 6 lines 1-4 teaches having delay contributing to location of a given portable subscriber unit or the activity of other portable subscriber units near a given portable subscriber unit. Souissi also teaches in column 7 lines 33-67 teaches having delay contributing to location of a given portable subscriber unit or the activity of other portable subscriber units near a given portable subscriber unit.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A). "Method and Apparatus in a wireless communication system for creating a learning function" by Reed et al. U.S. Patent # 6,263,209.

B). "Method and Apparatus in a two-way wireless communication system for location-based message transmission" by Souissi et al. U.S. Patent # 6,091,959.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dhairya A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-5809. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571-272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DAP


ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER